Preparations for the new Parliamentary Digital Service: Update

Paper from the Preparation Team

Purpose

1. This paper provides an update on the work being carried out to prepare for the establishment of the new Parliamentary Digital Service. It asks the Management Boards for decisions on governance for the Service and on its corporate functions.

The preparation team

2. The preparation team (members listed at the end of this paper) was set up in April. A summary of its work to date and continuing commitments can be found in annex 6.

Review of governance

3. In June, the Management Boards agreed that we should lead a review of the governance of the Digital Service. Our final report, which was circulated in draft to the staff we interviewed and others with an interest in this area in late September, can be found in annex 1 (pages 5–9). We invite the Management Boards to consider and agree our recommendations.

Corporate functions

4. We were also invited to review the Digital Service’s corporate functions—HR, finance, communications, and business planning/assurance—“to assess how the structure and resourcing of corporate functions within PICT meet the specific needs of the joint department, and to make recommendations about how those needs might be met in relation to the Digital Service”. The review was conducted by Mark Egan and Mary Ollard (with considerable assistance from Judy Goodall). Their final report, which was circulated in draft to the staff we interviewed and others with an interest in this area in late September, can be found in annex 2 (pages 11–19). We invite the Management Boards to consider and agree their recommendations.
Performance measures

5. A key element of the new arrangements will be the mechanisms by which the new Director is accountable to users for the progress made in increasing their satisfaction with Parliament’s digital offering, honouring the commitment made to public accountability by the two Clerks in March. We are very grateful to Jyoti Chandola, DCCS, for the work she has done for us on this subject: her working draft paper can be found at annex 3. Jyoti’s research has shown that the UK Parliament would be a world leader in making data about digital performance publicly available. However, there are well-known risks in performance measures and targets distorting decisions on policy which need to be thought through. In addition, it will be essential to get the new Director’s input into decisions about which measures to focus on and to publish.

6. It will also be important to emphasise that any measures made public provide only some of the information necessary to assess the success of Parliament’s digital strategy. The Director’s success should not be assessed entirely on the basis of publicly-available (or internal) performance measures, although open discussion of trends and their causes in senior management groups such as the proposed Digital Services Board should be the norm.

7. We intend to undertake further work on performance measures as part of our preparation of options for a digital strategy. We expect the new Director to make firm proposals for publicly-available performance measures in the new year. In the meantime, we invite the Management Boards to endorse our approach to the development of performance measures for the new Service.

Aspirations and opportunities

8. In our first paper to the Boards we drew attention to three important themes from the feedback received in response to the mySociety report on Parliament’s online services and the Clerks’ response. These were:

- Senior leaders must be able to articulate clearly why the Digital Service is being created—and what would happen if it were not. In our view, this change is essential in order to ensure that Parliament remains relevant in a digital world (and, indeed, to regain some lost relevance). If we do not make this change, the disconnection between Parliament and the people we are here to serve will grow, undermining our democracy.
• There must be widespread recognition that the digital agenda is not simply a matter for technical staff, in PICT and WIS. It will affect staff across both Houses, particularly, but not exclusively, in those departments and offices which generate parliamentary data and content.

• It is essential for the success of the Digital Service for decisions by the Management Boards, arrived at following extensive discussion and feedback, to be fully implemented throughout both organisations and not blocked lower down.

9. We have used our workshops to discuss these themes (and to articulate why the Digital Service is being created) and to find out the aspirations staff have for the Digital Service and the achievement of Parliament’s digital aims (see annex 4). In summary, the main aspirations and opportunities colleagues perceive are as follows:

• Staff want there to be good working relationships between the two Houses and the PDS based on collaboration, partnership and mutual respect for the professionalism and expertise in all parts of Parliament. In many areas working relationships are good, but there is awareness of difficulties, often historic. Staff want to find a way of moving on from such problems.

• Work on a digital strategy, as well as on over-arching corporate strategies, offers an opportunity to get greater clarity about what our strategic priorities should be. This should help ensure that we focus on the projects which matter to us most and do them well. Recent work on establishing ICT priorities for MTIP funding is a step in the right direction.

• Many staff welcome opportunities for more bicameral thinking about digital projects and are confident that the two Houses can work together in agreeing priorities, some of which will be specific to one House or the other. However, there are colleagues, particularly in the Lords, who are less confident that this can be achieved. The Digital Service needs to deliver for both Houses but both Management Boards have a part to play in making this happen and in demonstrating how a bicameral approach in this area benefits both Houses. Again, recent work on MTIP priorities shows how this can be achieved.

• There is enormous enthusiasm about the arrival of the new Director and the momentum they will create for digital delivery based on user need. However, it will be important to manage expectations and to continue to emphasise how departments and offices across both Houses have a key role in leading business change processes, in collaboration with the Digital Service.
• Staff want to explore more flexible processes for planning and delivering change, across departmental boundaries, and to learn from best practice in other organisations. Multi-disciplinary approaches to projects—most notably Q&A and the Commons Order Paper projects—are regarded as more effective than conventional models but are not yet fully embedded.

• Staff identified scope to review and, where appropriate, change business processes rather than always to emphasise the uniqueness of Parliament. Such an approach could reduce reliance on complex and expensive bespoke products, and make off-the-shelf solutions more likely.

10. We will focus on what needs to happen to make these changes in further workshops which bring together staff from both Houses, PICT and WIS. The Management Boards also have an important role in creating the environment necessary for change to happen. The work to prepare for the new Service has started us on the right road but there is much more to do, particularly in relation to communications about the new Service and the Boards’ digital aims and the development of the digital strategy and wider strategic thinking in both Houses.

11. We invite the Management Boards to discuss and respond to the aspirations and opportunities staff which across Parliament have communicated to us in relation to the creation of the Digital Service and to endorse our plans for further work in this area.

Equality analysis

12. We are grateful to Stacey Smith and the Parliagender committee for agreeing to lead on an equality analysis of the creation of the Digital Service and the wider implications of putting digital at the forefront of parliamentary work. Their initial analysis of the equality implications of these changes can be found at annex 5 and indicates the need for further work, which we will be pleased to assist with.

*Digital Service Preparation Team: Mark Egan, Alison Couch, Marianne Cwynarski, Jane Grieveson, Steve O’Connor, Mary Ollard, Gareth Sully
27 October 2014*
Annex 1: governance of the Digital Service

Introduction

1. In June, in considering our first paper on the establishment of the Parliamentary Digital Service, the Management Boards asked us to review sub-Board level governance of the Digital Service. This paper is the outcome of that review. Details of what the review entailed can be found in annex A.

Do we need sub-board level governance?

2. One suggestion put to us was that there was no need for a specific governance structure for the new Service. Other departments carry out their work without reporting to governance bodies other than their Management Boards: perhaps the Digital Service should be allowed to do the same. In this scenario, robust line management arrangements would be essential in order to ensure that the Digital Service delivered in accordance with the strategies and expectations of the two Houses.

3. Most of the people we interviewed either assumed that there would be a new governance body for the Digital Service or put forward reasons why there should be. **We share the majority view that there ought to be a bicameral governance body supporting the work of the Digital Service**, because:

   - There needs to be a bicameral forum in which the work and priorities of the Digital Service can be discussed, in recognition of the fact that the two Management Boards have chosen to work together to achieve digital aims. In addition, the new Director will look for support from Management Board colleagues in promoting change in business practices across Parliament.

   - The work of the Digital Service will affect every department and office in both Houses. It would be difficult for a line manager, inevitably based in one or other House, to represent all the various interests across Parliament in supporting the work of the new Director.

   - New governance arrangements must help build trust in the new Director and confidence in the new Service, particularly in the light of the difficulties which have been experienced in recent years in agreeing on priorities and strategic direction for online services. The aim would be for these new arrangements to be operated with a light touch as effective working
relationships developed. For example, quarterly meetings might be most appropriate given the strategic role we have in mind for the new governance body.

A new Digital Services Board: remit, composition, chair

Remit
4. The new Digital Services Board should be a sub-committee of both Management Boards and we propose that it should:

- Support the work of the Digital Service, and its Director, in ensuring that digital delivery is at the forefront of Parliament’s work, integrated into departmental business planning, and that user needs are prioritised; and in engaging others in achieving these aims

- Support the Director in developing Parliament’s digital strategy, subject to final approval by the Management Boards, and in delivering the strategy

- Make recommendations to the Management Boards about the allocation of funding for ICT/digital investment, as part of the MTIP process

- Review significant ICT/digital business cases and provide advice to the Finance Directors on the issues they raise

- Agree the Digital Service’s strategic performance measures and provide a forum for discussion of performance against those measures

- Agree policies for Parliament’s online services, including the website, intranet and social media, and support the Director in implementation.
5. There are a number of new features of this approach:

- The new board would have an overview of both digital strategy and expenditure, ensuring that the two Houses could approach the task of focusing on digital delivery in a coherent and co-ordinated manner. Greater visibility for expenditure on online services across Parliament would be a particularly significant advantage, filling a vacuum which has hindered the efficient and effective development of Parliament’s online services in recent years.

- It would explicitly support the new Director in their role in promoting and implementing change across Parliament.

- It would be expected to reach decisions and resolve conflict unless there was a clear need to escalate matters to the two Management Boards, for example if a question of strategic importance was involved. It would work collaboratively and in partnership across both Houses and the Digital Service to formulate strategic priority and direction for digital matters. In doing so, it would provide a more coherent and coordinated means of reaching decisions than would be the case if issues had to be taken to the two Management Boards separately.

6. The Management Boards are invited to consider and agree the broad remit for the Digital Services Board.

Composition

7. We make the following recommendations about the composition of the new board:

- All members of both Management Boards should receive papers for the new board.

- All executive members of both Management Boards (including the Director of the PDS) should be entitled to attend the new board, although we would not expect the corporate officers to do so.

- There should be two external members of the new board, with ICT and digital expertise.

8. A number of managers with an interest in ICT matters currently attend meetings of PICTAB to observe proceedings. They thought that it was an important way of understanding the rationale for decisions and for picking up signals about likely future developments. Some of the Management Board members we interviewed welcomed this transparency and openness. Others thought that the Director would be better supported by the frank discussion and effective decision making possible if the new Board met in private. On balance, we share this view and recommend that the new board should follow the practice of
its parent bodies and meet in private. As with the Management Boards, it would be normal practice to invite non-members to attend for specific items of business, including, for example, to present papers. Effective communication of information about the discussion and the outcome of meetings would be essential.

Chair
9. The chair will be expected to support the work of the new Director. He or she must give the Director latitude to bring their professional expertise to bear on Parliament’s digital challenges, helping to shape outcomes which meet both Houses’ strategies and distinctive cultures.

10. The choice of chair will be for the two corporate officers to make: we suggest that this should be a joint decision. Whoever is chosen must command confidence in both Houses. It would be desirable for the position of chair to alternate between the two Houses. Chairs should be expected to serve for at least two years.

Other governance groups?

11. Various suggestions were put to us about sub-groups which could monitor specific aspects of Parliament’s digital work—for example, relating to project finance, performance, or portfolio oversight. We think that arrangements in this area should be left to the new Board to decide.

Information Management Board
12. We were specifically asked to review the role of the Information Management Board, which was set up in 2011 to “act as a source of expert advice to PICTAB and PICT on Information Management and Data Strategy”. It has broad terms of reference to develop and own information management and data strategies.

13. Interviewees felt that the IM Board had succeeded in bringing together a diverse range of managers across both Houses with an interest in information management. However, there is still a significant amount of work to do to draw up information management and data strategies. The enabling technologies programme is now involved in this area and the IM Board, now chaired by Mark Hutton, has a new focus on combining strategic information management with practical measures with business benefit which it will be promoting over the next few months. As an advisory group reporting to PICTAB, the Information Management Board in its current form should be wound up when PICTAB ceases to exist. However, it will be important for work on information management and management of data to continue at both a strategic and practical level. There is a business requirement for a mechanism to bring together the creators, managers and owners
of information with the technical and ICT specialists who are responsible for the systems in which it is created, stored and promulgated. We recommend that the Director of the Digital Service, the current chair of the IM Board, the SROs of the enabling technologies programme and the Digital Services Board prioritise consideration of what should be the best arrangements for that future work.

User groups
14. We were told that both the Information Management Board and the SUN user group, which has contributed to the implementation of the ICT Strategy, were useful fora for managers with a stake in ICT and digital matters to discuss and provide feedback on initiatives in this area. We would expect the Digital Services Board to consider whether something similar should be set up, for example bringing together managers from departmental teams focusing on digital delivery such as the Commons Committee Office Web and Publications Unit and the Education Service Public Engagement and Learning team.

Secretariat
15. Interviewees mostly thought that the secretariat of a sub-committee of the Management Boards should, in principle, be provided from either the Office of the Chief Executive in the Commons or the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments rather than by the Digital Service. We agree, as this would ensure that the new board’s work is fully co-ordinated with the work of the two Management Boards and other corporate groups, takes into account the interests of all the departments and offices of both Houses, and can be seen to do so.

16. This recommendation is in no way a reflection on the work of the PICTAB secretariat, which was widely praised. The staff concerned also have responsibilities relating to other aspects of the work of PICT’s Resources Directorate, including business planning, risk and performance management and corporate compliance. There will be a continuing need for these functions in the Digital Service. The Director of the PDS and the Finance Directors will also need support in handling the MTIP process and its implications for the Digital Service’s resources. If the Boards accept our recommendation the Office of the Chief Executive, the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and PICT must work together on implementation.

Digital Service Preparation Team
September 2014, revised October 2014
Annex A: conduct of the review

1. The review comprised interviews, carried out by members of the preparation team, with: Myfanwy Barrett, John Borley, Simon Burton, Rebecca Elton, Liz Hallam Smith, Andrew Makower, Joan Miller, Stephanie Peterson, John Pullinger and Andrew Walker. It has also benefited from conversations with a number of others who have been involved in this area, particularly Richard McLean and Steven Mark. We are grateful to everyone who made time to speak to us.

2. We have also drawn on the papers which explain the antecedents, genesis and development of PICTAB over the years as well as a wide range of information we have gathered in conducting our broader work in preparing for the Digital Service.

3. There were numerous responses to the draft of this paper, including in writing from PICT directors, Caroline Auty, John Borley, Tracy Green, Liz Hallam Smith, Andrew Makower and Ed Ollard, which have helped shaped the final version.
Annex 2: the Digital Service’s corporate functions

Introduction

1. In July, following consideration by the Management Boards of our first paper on the establishment of the Parliamentary Digital Service, the two Clerks asked us to “to assess how the structure and resourcing of corporate functions within PICT meet the specific needs of the joint department, and to make recommendations about how those needs might be met in relation to the Digital Service”.

2. The context for the review included the Management Boards’ wish to reduce or remove barriers to closer working between the Digital Service and other departments of the two Houses, and to dispel perceptions that PICT has developed an organisational culture at odds with that of the Commons service or Lords administration. However, in launching the review, the Clerks said “we seek no specific outcome; it may be that the review validates the present position. But in terms of future governance it is important that the arrangements are robust and are seen to be so”.

3. The corporate functions we reviewed are: finance, HR, communications, and business planning/assurance. An organogram showing the people and areas involved within PICT can be found at annex A. The review was not concerned with the performance of these areas or of the people working in them. Much of the work by staff engaged in supporting PICT’s corporate functions was widely praised.

4. The review consisted of interviews of PICT and WIS staff (conducted by Mark Egan) as well as staff in relevant parts of the Commons and Lords (conducted by Judy Goodall). Details of who was interviewed and who provided written submissions can be found in annex B. Mark and Judy are grateful to all of those who assisted with this review.

5. This report has been prepared by Mark Egan and Mary Ollard, on behalf of the Digital Service Preparation Team.

Finance

Resourcing

6. There are six posts in the PICT finance team complement (1 A1, 2 B1, 2 B2 and 1 C). Of these one of the B1s is a part time accountant who focuses on programme finance and one of the B2s is a new management accounts and contract officer role,
with a remit to enhance the department’s contract management, working closely with the Parliamentary Procurement and Commercial Service. The C Band post is currently unfilled with no plans at present to recruit to it.

**What do they do and why?**

7. The PICT finance team operates in the same way as finance teams in Commons departments, the closest comparator being the Department of Facilities. In other words, it manages PICT’s budget, under delegated authority from the Finance Directors of the two Houses. (In the Lords, only the Catering and Retail Service has its own separate finance function, and this is headed up by someone from central finance). The relationship between the two Houses and PICT in respect of financial matters is set out in the 2007 report of the Joint Department Implementation Board (JDIB) to the Corporate Officers. PICT uses the Commons HAIS system.

8. The PICT finance team is sizeable but this can be justified in terms of the size of the department’s budget; complexity because of PICT’s status as a joint department (for example, the two Houses treat IT hardware differently in their annual accounts); inherent complexity in the financial arrangements for ICT (especially licences); the team’s role in supporting business-led programmes; and the increasing importance of contract management and the interface with the Procurement and Commercial Service.

**Issues**

9. Two issues were raised with us about the framework within which the PICT finance team operates:

   - Lead finance managers in Commons departments are counter-signed by the Director of Finance or the Director of Financial Management, who thereby have a stake in recruitment and oversight of performance. This is not the case in PICT.

   - The 2007 JDIB report on setting up PICT said that “in matters of financial control and procedures PICT will continue to follow the guidance and practices applied in the House of Lords and the House of Commons with such adaptations as are necessary to reflect its specific character as a joint department”. This proved to be unhelpfully ambiguous and, under a letter of financial delegation dated 23 April 2012, PICT now follows Commons procedures (with a few exceptions where both Houses’ rules apply, for example, rules about signing off certain levels of expenditure).
**Recommendations**

10. The Digital Service’s Head of Finance should be line managed, as now, by a Director of Resources within the Service; but the post should be counter-signed by the Commons Director of Finance (as is the case for the lead finance role in the Department of Facilities), who should liaise with her Lords counterpart in undertaking this role.

11. The Service should apply Commons financial controls and procedures. The Finance Directors, working with the Digital Service, should be invited to agree a list of additions, exceptions and modifications to this arrangement, which should be justified by business need and kept as short as possible.

12. A new financial memorandum setting out the governance arrangements (including matters covered in the paragraphs below) for the Digital Service, replacing the 2007 JDIB report, should be prepared for signature by the Commons and Lords Finance Directors and the Director of the Digital Service.

**HR**

**Resourcing**

13. There are six posts in the PICT HR team (1 A1, 2 B1, 1 B2 and 2 C). One of the B1 posts is filled by two staff members, each working part-time. The B1 HR managers are generalists, although each leads on specific areas. The A1 team leader also manages the section providing administrative and office support to the department, which was outside the scope of this review.

**What do they do and why?**

14. PICT staff have a different employment status from staff of either House, in that they are employed by both. The PICT HR team provides a full range of HR services to PICT, including policy development, support for managers in dealing with performance issues, recruitment, learning and development, and maintenance of HR records. In terms of the scope of its activities, PICT HR operates similarly to the Lords HR function. However, in general, there has been less delegation of HR functions to line managers in PICT than there has been in the House of Commons.

15. The 2007 JDIB report requires PICT to “conform as far as possible with the [HR] policies and frameworks prevailing in each House”. It also recommended that PICT should have its own staff handbook, reflecting PICT’s “distinctive operational and employment profile” which “may require policies, for example on hours and allowances, to be adopted locally within the overall framework and by agreement with the Corporate Officers”. In practice, PICT staff’s terms and conditions are almost identical to those for Commons staff, the only significant differences being that PICT staff are currently exempt from Commons time-
recording and subject to a more onerous alcohol policy. For this reason, and because PICT uses the same HAIS system as the Commons, PICT HR tends to follow Commons policies and guidance.

16. PICT’s senior managers have a high regard for PICT HR staff, their understanding of the many complex roles performed within the department and how best to recruit to those roles, either by finding permanent staff or contractors. For example, application processes have been varied to attract candidates for developer roles who may not be prepared to complete lengthy application forms. The ‘recruitment for potential’ scheme, developed as part of the ICT strategy, was praised for helping the department and its staff deal with the changes which the strategy introduced.

Issues

17. There was widespread agreement that PICT HR works well for PICT. However, there may be different ways in which HR functions for the Digital Service could be configured to provide a better outcome in future for Parliament as a whole. One issue raised with us concerned the ratio of HR staff to departmental staff, which appears to be higher in PICT than in the Commons and Lords as well as in the wider public service. Efficiency may be an argument in favour of the Digital Service’s HR functions being provided by the Commons. (Transfer to the Lords would not be practical because there are significant differences in terms and conditions between PICT and Lords staff).

18. There would be no legal difficulty in making such a change but there would be some important risks to manage. It cannot be assumed that all PICT HR staff would wish to transfer to the Commons and slot into the DHRC structure. Some might choose to go elsewhere, leading to a loss of expertise in ICT HR issues. Although that expertise could be built up again, and spread across a larger HR department leading to more resilience, that would inevitably take some time. However, it should be noted that a number of current members of DHRC have spent time working in PICT HR.

19. WIS management, whose HR functions are provided by DHRC, described a number of challenges in ensuring that HR staff understand the market for digital recruitment, and did not think that those challenges were all being successfully met at the moment. They, along with PICT managers, expressed concerns at the possibility of the Digital Service relying on the Commons for HR functions from day one, particularly as the incoming Director’s plans may require significant input from HR in order to be achieved.

20. Another issue raised with us was that PICT had sometimes chosen to follow different policies from the Commons, which it was argued had encouraged the department to think of itself as separate from the two Houses. Time recording, which the Commons
adopted but PICT did not, was mentioned by several interviewees. PICT has also developed its own competency framework as well as a policy on flexible working, following a recent statutory change.

21. Finally, all concerned thought that there was scope for more informal co-ordination and sharing of best practice across Parliament on HR matters. However, it was argued that informal co-ordination alone could not counter differing organisational cultures and that the establishment of the new Service provided an opportunity to make a significant change to the Service’s HR function. If this opportunity was not taken culture and practices would continue to diverge, making any future integration more difficult for the Digital Service.

Recommendations

22. There is a case for the Digital Service’s HR functions to be provided by the Commons DHRC, but there would be risks in making this change now at the same time as the Digital Service is launched. The new department is likely to face some significant HR challenges in its first couple of years, as the incoming Director restructures and refocuses their team. Changing the way in which HR functions are provided to the Digital Service could reduce both the ICT HR expertise available to the Director and confidence in the HR services being provided.

23. On the other hand, if a separate HR function is maintained there is a risk that the new Director’s vision may be implemented in a way which is not integrated with the two Houses. This could reinforce separation and create barriers between the Service and the two Houses.

24. Our view of the balance of risks inclines us to recommend that the Digital Service should be launched with its own HR team. This should be reviewed in 2017, as part of the previously-agreed governance review.

25. In the meantime, there should be closer links between the Digital Service’s HR team and the HR teams in the two Houses. In order to achieve this:

- the Digital Service’s Head of HR should be line managed, as now, by a Director of Resources within the Service, but the post should be counter-signed by the Director of HR Services, thus ensuring that she, and the Director General of HR and Change (as head of profession), have an overview of HR across the Commons and the Digital Service.

- the Digital Service should not have its own staff handbook and nor should it develop its own HR policies. The Service should take the Commons’ lead in these matters. Where there are differences between the terms and
conditions of Commons and Digital Service staff these should be clearly indicated in the Commons Staff Handbook and should either be justified by business need or be harmonised.

- DHRC should take on responsibility for making Digital Service staff changes in HAIS: this could improve data consistency because DHRC staff specialise in this work and the number of PICT changes each month is relatively small.

- there should be regular meetings of HR practitioners across both Houses (including the Digital Service).

26. Given that we are recommending closer integration of PICT’s HR team and DHRC as well as a transfer of policy-making responsibilities from one to the other, this is an area in which we would expect PICT (and subsequently the Digital Service) to seek opportunities to improve efficiency.

Communications

Resourcing
27. There are currently three posts in the PICT communications team (1 contractor A1 equivalent, 1 B2 on temporary promotion to B1 and 1 temporary substantive B2 appointment).

What do they do and why?
28. The team helps plan communications relating to ICT programmes, which often involve various categories of users across Parliament as well as significant business change aspects, as well as routine internal communications (eg departmental newsletters). PICT developed its own communications strategy for the first time in 2014. This was explicitly intended to raise PICT’s profile with users (including Members) as well as to develop a brand identity for PICT in the ICT industry, to help with staff recruitment.

29. The service desk customer relations team leads on communications to network users about routine maintenance issues as well as about immediate operational issues. The communications team provides light-touch oversight of this work.

Issues
30. Some communications from PICT to Members and Peers about ICT projects—Office 365 being a good example—have caused concerns to be expressed by the corporate internal communications teams in both Houses. Those teams argue that they are not
always fully involved in planning such communications, which then take them by surprise, may not be well-coordinated with other communications, may use language at variance from what the corporate teams consider to be best practice, and may lead to difficult feedback to which they must respond. Feedback from domestic committees, and differing views about how that feedback should be managed, had added to the mix.

31. The PICT communications team’s view is that it is best placed to know its users and that it sometimes finds itself in the difficult position of trying to balance the separate needs of the two Houses in developing effective communications.

32. A sense of separateness has been increased by the decision to create a communications strategy for the department. For example, the corporate communications staff in the two Houses were not invited to contribute to the strategy or to comment on a draft, and it was argued that such involvement would not have been appropriate because PICT is a separate organisation. No other Commons or Lords department has developed its own communications strategy or issues communications to Members or Peers without going through the corporate offices.

33. There was a widespread feeling that more attention could be paid to the substance and style of routine communications about PICT’s services. Problems in communicating to users about major problems were widely acknowledged. Senior management had previously taken the view, contrary to best practice, that the less that was said about such issues the better. There is now an opportunity to change this approach.

34. External communications professionals in both Houses also expressed concerns about PICT’s desire to increase its public profile, for example by promoting the Director’s speaking engagements or interviews in the trade press. Comments which could seem unexceptional in one context could have unintended political ramifications, which staff in corporate teams would have to handle. Again, the importance of co-ordination was emphasised.
Recommendations

35. The Digital Service’s communications requirements will be considerable, from routine internal communications for its own staff, through routine and urgent communications to service users about problems and forthcoming changes, to assisting project teams with communications about new services and new ways of working. The Digital Service may have greater requirements than does PICT and these may well grow as Parliament increasingly prioritises digital working and exploits new communication methods. In the short-term there will be significant requirements associated with the general election and the launch of the PDS. Further assessment of longer-term requirements is necessary before permanent arrangements for the Service’s communications can be established.

36. Improved co-ordination with the corporate communications teams in both Houses is essential. PICT is now working with the Office of the Chief Executive and the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments to achieve this. It is proposed that when the current head of the PICT communications team leaves in November the role will be covered on an interim basis by a senior member of the OCE communications team who will lead cross-Parliament ICT and digital communications during the transition and launch of the Digital Service and over the general election period. Existing PICT communications team members will be line managed by the new team leader and counter-signed by the PICT Director of Resources.

37. The new team leader will make an early assessment of whether, and at what level, the existing contractor post in PICT needs to be replaced. There will also be new opportunities for PICT communications staff to work on a broader range of corporate initiatives, cutting across departmental boundaries and across both Houses. Work will also begin on assessing the Digital Service’s likely long-term communication needs and the resourcing necessary to meet them. The aim should be for long-term arrangements to be agreed by autumn 2015, after the general election and the PDS launch.

38. This change will, in effect, create a shadow Digital Service communications team which could also work closely with WIS on its communications to parliamentary service users in the period before the new Service is formally established.

39. In order for this interim arrangement to succeed, continuing close co-operation between the communications teams in both Houses, both internal and external, will be essential. The Lords communications teams must be fully involved in all digital and ICT communications activity. Existing working relationships between the relevant professionals are strong: they are confident that this new arrangement will work and so are we.

40. Developing an effective protocol for urgent communications to service users about unexpected problems is also necessary. PICT management have demonstrated their intention to take a more open and transparent approach to such problems in future.
An important element in judging the success of these interim arrangements will be whether there are demonstrable improvements to urgent communications.

41. We would expect the Digital Service to play a full part in the development of any communications strategies for the Commons and the Lords: it should not pursue a separate communications strategy of its own.

42. We invite the Management Boards to endorse the broad approach we have set out for Digital Service communications and to agree the proposed interim arrangements for the leadership of digital/ICT communications, which will be reviewed in 12 months.

**Business planning/assurance**

*Resources*

43. The directorate which supports business planning, performance management, risk management and related functions and provides the secretariats for PICTAB and the Information Management Board, comprises six posts (1 A1, 2 A2, 3 B1). Members of this team tend to perform a broad range of tasks within this area.

*What do they do and why?*

44. PICT produces an annual business plan and an annual report, which contribute to the business planning and reporting processes of both Houses. This directorate also responds to requests from the two Houses for assurance on financial and risk issues and contributes to responses to FOI requests to either House where PICT might hold the requested information on behalf of either House (PICT is not a separate public authority for the purposes of the FOI Act).

45. The secretariat roles in this area were not part of this review but are discussed in the review of corporate governance.

*Issues*

46. The main issue raised with us concerned insufficient co-ordination between PICT and the two Houses. For example, the two Houses require similar assurance information but use differently worded questions with different timescales for answer. In addition, PICT is required to meet the different requirements and timetables of the two Houses’ business planning rounds and sometimes satisfies neither completely.

47. Difficulties over compliance with FOI requests were also raised with us.
Recommendations

48. The formation of the Digital Service provides an opportunity to address a number of institutional difficulties which have grown up during PICT's existence and which have unnecessarily complicated business planning, risk management and related activities. Detailed matters to do with timetables and templates—what information is required, by which House, in what form, when—can and should now be looked at afresh. We recommend that PICT's Director of Resources and relevant senior officials in both Houses do this, to ensure that the Digital Service can meet the planning and reporting requirements of both Houses in as straightforward a way as possible.

49. In relation to FOI requests, there is scope for better information sharing and more closely aligned procedures, to enable staff responsible for FOI compliance in both Houses to make informed decisions. We recommend that the relevant staff in PICT and the two Houses seek to achieve this.

Conclusion

50. Our recommendations are intended to assist the Digital Service in working more closely with the two Houses. Although we found some genuine problems which need to be resolved there are also issues of perception, where staff in the two Houses felt that PICT had "in the past" played one House off against the other without being able to recall specific instances. On the other hand, some PICT staff said they sometimes felt that the two House administrations did not always treat them on an equal footing with other parliamentary staff. The launch of the Digital Service provides an opportunity to leave behind the baggage and damaging perceptions of how things might have been and to establish working relationships and arrangements which define how we want staff across Parliament to work together to achieve the digital aims from now on.

Mark Egan and Mary Ollard
September 2014, revised October 2014
Annex A: Organogram

PICT resources directorate as at October 2014
Annex B: Conduct of the review

1. The following people were interviewed in the course of the review:

   - **Finance:** Peter Lamb; Chris Ridley, Myfanwy Barrett, Andrew Makower, Jonathan Smith
   - **HR:** Jonathan Seller, Jane Ajao, Bita McIntosh, Kerrie Steer; Alix Langley, Tom Mohan, James Taylor
   - **Communications:** Leigh Jackson, Jess Bull; Marianne Cwynarski, Anikka Weerasinghe, Alison Couch, Owen Williams; Sean Larkins (Head of Government Communication Policy & Capability)
   - **Business planning:** Stephanie Peterson; Jane Hough, Michael Torrance
   - **PICT:** Steven Mark, Matthew Taylor, Steve O’Connor, Dan Barrett, Rob Sanders, Tim Youngs, Tracey Jessup, Caroline Kelly
   - **WIS:** Tracy Green
   - **Others:** Veronica Daly, Deborah Shirtcliffe (DFin), Simon Burton (HL)

Some interviewees provided us with written notes. We also received written submissions from Caroline Auty, Jess Bull, Emma Briggs, Rebecca Elton, and Stephanie Peterson.

2. Responses to the draft version of this report were heard at a meeting of Resources Directorate staff attended by preparation team members on 25 September and received in writing from members of PICT’s corporate relations team, Alison Couch, Tom Goldsmith, Leigh Jackson, Tracey Jessup, Andrew Makower, Steven Mark, Michael Torrance, and Andrew Walker and Alix Langley.
Annex 3: Performance measures

Draft paper by Jyoti Chandola, DCCS

Performance measures are an important tool for any organisation. The right measures can support the delivery of the organisation’s strategic aims and help guide decisions on where to allocate resources. The creation of the new Digital Service is an opportunity to set new performance measures that help to develop clarity of purpose. In addition to the strategic measures set by the management boards of both Houses (or the proposed new Digital Services Board), the new Director of the Digital Service and his or her management team are likely to want to set a range of sub-board level performance measures for the Service.

Other organisations

One of the recommendations that the Management Boards of both Houses agreed to implement following the mySociety report into Parliament’s online services was,

To appoint a Head of Digital to run that organisation, publicly accountable for delivering measurably rising levels of satisfaction with Parliament’s digital services from Members, staff and the public.

While other Parliaments may include aspects of digital or ICT performance as part of a wider commitment to transparency we have not been able to find examples of other parliaments providing public information on the performance of digital services in the way proposed in the mySociety report.

Government Digital Service

The Government Digital Service (GDS) has done a lot of work on performance measures—both in terms of ensuring transparency for the performance data it has and in providing guidance on how to develop effective performance measures. The GDS produced a Digital Performance Framework; a shortened version of the Framework is available as a seven point checklist for developing performance measures. The points are:
Performance management data is presented on a performance platform. The GDS uses two types of dashboard—service and activity. There are 84 service dashboards which contain information about specific services such as booking a driving test, registering to vote or making a payment for a service. Measures include: transactions per year, total cost, cost per transaction, live service usages, digital take-up, user satisfaction, time to complete the transaction, service availability and number of users completing each step of a transaction.

The activity dashboards cover the online content of government departments and other bodies. Measures include: site traffic, most popular content by category, how users access content, new and returning visitors, sources of visitors, feedback received, most commented pages. There is also an overall activity dashboard for the gov.uk site which shows usage, service availability, traffic, how people access the site and the top content, announcements and policies as well as the top trending content.

The performance platform covers a wide range of measures. These can be broadly broken down into the following categories:

- How people are using the service (how they are accessing it, what they are looking at what, how long the use the service for)
- The user experience
- How much people are using the service (or parts of it)
- Technical aspects of the service, such as availability
• The behaviour change the service is driving (such as a move to digital take-up)
• The cost to run the service

Although the performance measures in Annex A cover the majority of these categories, there are some omissions. The GDS has a clear aim to increase online transactions and reduce face-to-face or telephone transactions. This may not be appropriate in all areas of parliamentary activity.

The GDS also measures the cost to run services, such as the cost per transaction for a service. While similar measures could be developed for Parliament, they are not currently included in the list of proposed measures. Partly this is due to the limited range of transactions that take place through the internet and intranet. It is also a recognition that although value for money is an important goal for the digital service, ‘cost per visitor’ or a similar measure would not take into account the political or public interest reasons for developing web content and services.

The Management Boards will also need to consider how greater transparency for digital performance measures might affect information management in other areas.

**Current measures in Parliament**

*PICT*- PICT currently reports to the House of Commons Management Board and the House of Lords Management Board. The information requested by each House is set out below.

For the House of Commons the monthly measures are:
• ICT core network availability
• Outlook availability
• Support cases resolved by deadline (for Commons staff and for Commons Members and their staff)

A quarterly report contains a performance summary on achievements in the last quarter, operational and capacity issues, staffing, finance and savings, interdependencies, reputational issues, technical issues and procurement and contracts.

The House of Lords management board receives a quarterly report that includes:
Performance measures

- ICT core network availability
- Average PICT helpdesk wait time
- Support cases resolved in deadline: Members and their staff
- Support cases resolved in deadline: House staff

Activity data

- Members: users of PN
- Members: total items of IT equipment issued in the quarter
- Members: total number of iPads connected to the network
- Lords' Staff: total user accounts

Projects, programmes and initiatives (narrative)

- Implementation of ICT Strategy
- Telephony replacement

PICT has an internal performance board which meeting once a month.

WIS—The Web and Internet Service use Google Analytics, user surveys and other software to track the performance of the Parliament website, intranet and social media accounts. Ten measures are included in a report to the Commons Management Board. These are:

- Average length of site visit
- % of satisfied/very satisfied users (from survey)
- % users finding what they were looking for (from survey)
- Quality of information rated good or very good (from survey)
- Average page load speed at 512kbps
- Average uptime
- Email alert subscribers
- Twitter followers
- Number of visits
- Number of visitors

No information is currently reported to the Lords Management Board.
Social media

As the use of social media evolves and expands, the metrics used to measure performance are also evolving. There are more sophisticated ways to track engagement beyond the number of followers or retweets. Organisations are also discovering that having a clear aim for social media performance measures, for example increasing followers or getting more comments for each post, rather than a general aim such as ‘improve social media presence’, is important.

Feedback on the current system

In preparing this paper we spoke to PICT and WIS colleagues and others with a role in the current performance management system. There was consensus that the creation of the Digital Service was an opportunity to learn from the current arrangements and improve on them.

Most of the comments on performance measures related to one of four areas:

Designing and reviewing performance measures
Several people were keen to point out that performance measures could cause unintended outcomes or have a disproportionate impact on departmental priorities. One example given was the waiting time for a call to be answered by the help desk. Some of the people we spoke to felt that measure (how long it takes a call to be answered) wasn’t a good indicator for the desired outcome (a better service for callers to the helpdesk). Not only did the measure not fully cover the desired outcome but by creating an incentive for help-desk staff to complete calls quickly so they could be available for new calls it could be damaging the overall quality of the service.

Some of the people interviewed felt that the high level measures seen by the Management Boards should be reviewed and updated more regularly to ensure they worked as intended, were measuring the right things and were still relevant.

To be as effective as possible, the performance measures for the Digital Service should be aligned with the strategic objectives of both Houses. The measures should be reviewed at regular intervals to ensure that they are still relevant. The impact of the measures should also be reviewed to ensure they are supporting improvements.
**Risk and innovation**

One view put forward by a number of people was that the targets set for the new Digital Service shouldn’t stifle innovation or prevent the service from capitalising on opportunities. While some things, such as network availability, require a cautious approach to risk, other potential targets, such as improving customer satisfaction with the helpdesk, or the development of new tools and services, may benefit from an approach which accepts the possibility of short-term failure for long-term benefits. The corporate attitude to and appetite for risk is something that should be considered when developing performance measures.

**A single set of measures**

At present, PICT reports a separate set of measures to the Management Board of each House and WIS reports only to the House of Commons Management Board. The Digital Service performance measures should support the achievement of strategic goals and objectives. They can identify the need for future changes to strategy to enable the delivery of objectives. It would be sensible for the new service to report on the same measures to both the House of Commons and the House of Lords, partly to reduce the administrative burden to the Service and also to promote the link between the performance measures and overall objectives for the Digital Service.

**Accountability and responsibility**

The Digital Service and its Director will be accountable for meeting the performance targets set by the Management Boards of both Houses. However, the Digital Service will need to rely on colleagues in other parts of Parliament to meet some targets. Improving user satisfaction with the website, for example, requires both technical work for which the Digital Service will be responsible and an effort from content creators in other departments to ensure that the content is up to date and considers the needs of web users.

**Performance Measures**

The Management Boards of both Houses (and the proposed Digital Services Board) will be asked to agree a limited number of high level performance measures to provide direction for the Digital Service. The success criteria for each measure should be clearly defined. An indicative set of performance measures is included for further discussion in Annex A.

In order to help with the development of performance measures, three suggested principles based on the conversations and research for this paper are below:
Principles for good performance measures

- Performance measures should be aligned to strategic objectives and reviewed regularly.
- Targets should be stretching but should not stifle innovation or the ability to capitalise on opportunities for improving services.
- The focus of performance measures should be on the desired outcome or performance standard. This will support the development of responsive measurements that seek to avoid or minimise distorting the work of the department.

Public accountability

The new Director and staff of the Digital Service should be accountable for their work through the usual management chain. However, this does not mean that the Digital Service should not inform and engage with its users, both internal and external, when it comes to performance measures. The Digital Service, working with both Houses, should develop and keep up-to-date an activity dashboard to be published on parliament.uk. The Digital Service's annual report should also include this information, with commentary to explain trends.

Jyoti Chandola, October 2014
**Indicative performance measures covering web presence, engagement, social media and provision of data—external users**

Some of the measures in this group assume that a 2 question survey is used to gather feedback from users. The first question would be a traffic-light ‘rate this page’ question. The second would be: Did you find the information you were looking for yes/no. The survey would be a pop up appearing at random across the site.

**Performance measures covering web presence, engagement, social media and provision of data—internal users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>How the information will be gathered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to the website can find the information they are looking for.</td>
<td>xx% of respondents using the site can find the information they are looking for.</td>
<td>Feedback button on search page [Could you find what you wanted? – yes/no] and second question on site survey. <strong>Cost implications need to be assessed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parliamentary website is an outreach tool; the site allows and encourages visitors to deepen their understanding of Parliament and its work.</td>
<td>Average pages per session (indicating that people are visiting more content) &gt; x and average time spent on each page &gt;x</td>
<td>Analytics currently collected by WIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The website provides a good user experience and relevant information.</td>
<td>&lt;x% of respondents using the site rate it as ‘red’.</td>
<td>Pop up survey for site users. <strong>Cost implications need to be assessed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament’s social media accounts have a positive impact on people’s engagement with and view of Parliament.</td>
<td>Click through rate on social media messages with a link &gt; x% Increase in Klout score and positive sentiment towards Parliament.</td>
<td>Click-through on tweets/re-tweets/FB messages with links. Klout score and Hootsuite sentiment metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>How the information will be gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intranet allows users to find relevant and up to date information quickly and easily.</td>
<td>&gt;x% of respondents can’t find what they were looking for</td>
<td>Feedback button on search page [Could you find what you wanted? – yes/no]. <em>Cost implications need to be assessed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Digital Service enables content creators to manage their content effectively, ensuring the internet and intranet is kept up to date.</td>
<td>&gt;x% of content owners satisfied or very satisfied with ability to manage content. Reduction in requests for assistance.</td>
<td>Annual survey of content owners (perhaps as a condition of members of their teams being able to edit content or as part of refresher training?) <em>Survey would be new, requires further consideration</em> Log of calls reporting problems/requesting help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The website provides a good user experience and relevant information.</td>
<td>&lt;x% of respondents using the site rate it as ‘red’.</td>
<td>Pop up survey for site users. <em>Cost implications would need to be assessed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>How the information will be gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Digital Service take a proactive approach to resolving technical issues both by anticipating and taking action to avoid system-wide problems and by seeking to identify any underlying issues for individual users contacting the help desk.</td>
<td>Increase in routine calls being logged through PICT online. Narrative update on proactive measures introduced and progress made.</td>
<td>Information taken from helpdesk logs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary ICT allows staff, Members of both Houses and their staff to work effectively. Procurement and maintenance provides good value for money.</td>
<td>Procurement of equipment provides equal to or better value for money when benchmarked against other relevant organisations. &gt;x% staff survey respondents agree/tend to agree that they have the ICT and ICT support needed to do their jobs effectively. &gt;x% Members and Peers satisfied or very satisfied with the quality of service provided.</td>
<td>Further work needed on benchmarking. Existing staff survey question. Member survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service desk provides a professional and responsive service for Members, Peers, their staff and staff of both Houses.</td>
<td>&gt;x% satisfaction with service desk contact.</td>
<td>Request for feedback through PICT online emailed once logged calls closed. Possible instant feedback following a call using telephone keypad. Further work on this would be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parliamentary network is stable and good network availability allows Members, Peers, their staff and staff of both Houses to work effectively.</td>
<td>% of month core network service has been available.</td>
<td>Existing core network service availability data collected by PICT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: Digital aims

Agreed by the Management Boards, June 2014

- The task of the Digital Service will be to help deliver both Houses’ strategies.

- Its work will be driven by priorities agreed jointly by the two Houses, reflecting the individual and collective needs of both bodies, with advice and support from the Service.

- The working relationship between the Digital Service and other departments of the two Houses will be based on collaboration, partnership and mutual respect for the professionalism and expertise of staff in all parts of Parliament, and on a clear commitment from all involved to making the Digital Service a success.

- Parliament’s presence on all online channels, including the external-facing website and internal-facing business systems, will seek to meet the needs of all user groups, both internal and external, specialist and non-specialist, with increasing levels of satisfaction across the board, whilst achieving value for money.

- Parliamentary data will be made easily and freely accessible in an open format for reuse, so that the value of parliamentary data may be fully realized.

- We will provide the IT equipment, infrastructure and support services parliamentarians, their staff and parliamentary staff, need for their work, wherever they are working, whilst achieving value for money.

- We will enable the development of digital capability across the whole of Parliament, working collaboratively with external agencies (such as Government departments) where necessary.

- The Digital Service will keep abreast of future technological developments, so that Members, their staff and parliamentary staff can make best use of the software, equipment and infrastructure available to them in their work, and so that the two Houses can make timely and well-informed investment decisions.
Annex 5: Equality analysis screening

_Paper from Stacey Smith on behalf of Parliagender_

**Screening**

The purpose of this screening phase is to decide whether you need to proceed or not to a full EA. Where equality issues are not affected or there is little impact on people of the policy you are reviewing, you will only need to complete this screening phase. However, if there is (or could be) a significant impact, it’s important to understand this and proceed to a full EA.

(Please note, where we use the word Policy, we are referring to a policy, procedure, project or major decision. For more detailed guidance on what this means, please have a look at the EA Guidelines.)

**Name of Policy being reviewed: The new Parliamentary Digital Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the aims, objectives or purpose of this policy?</td>
<td>Parliament looks to establish a new digital service, bringing together the management of all online and ICT services into a single organisation. As part of establishing the Parliamentary Digital Service (PDS) a new Head of Digital will be appointed to run the organisation and be publically accountable for delivering measurable levels of increased satisfaction of its digital services from members, staff and the public. Although not fully defined at this stage, it is clear that the establishment of the PDS will deliver significant changes in ways of working, collaboration and culture with Parliamentary staff and indeed the way that users interact with the service and future technology. The purpose of conducting this initial equality analysis screening will be to determine the possible impact of this change on protected characteristics as determined in the Equality Act 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the needs of different groups of people taken into account when deciding on these?</td>
<td>Extensive investigation has been conducted by the PDS Preparation Team to gather the views from staff groups across departments on what a PDS would entail and what its’ priorities should be going forward. Parliagender has reviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the outcomes of this investigation and has reflected on the equality impact and requirements that should also be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Does the policy have any direct impact on people? Use the Comment column to describe the potential impact. | ✓   |    |        | The emergence of the PDS will directly impact Members of Parliament, staff and members of the public via their connection to and use of digital technology provided by the new service. Some areas of potential impact on the above groups of people will be the provision of:  
  - Visitor services – move to a more electronic means of ticketing, scheduling, advertisement and learning activities for visitors to Parliament;  
  - Internet – move to more transparent, and engaging Parliament with increased digital connection to constituents via social media;  
  - Availability of data – aspiration to provide data easier, faster and more openly via electronic means to members of the public and Parliamentary staff;  
  - Legacy software update and / or renewal – move to more digital capability, removing (where required) manual interventions and processes for support services;  
  - Hardware services – delivering first class electrical hardware to Parliamentary staff;  
  - Technical support – move toward increasing the amount of technical support and advice available online which will impact all Parliamentary staff and in particular those without immediate access to technology such as catering and PED staff. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>It is possible that an increase in Parliament's digital profile, promoting a move towards a more diverse working environment will encourage an increase of ethnic backgrounds into the workplace and engagement in Parliamentary business which is a positive outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers with a disability status may make some transactions online and via digital devices more difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customers who are elderly may find it more difficult to engage with digitalised parliamentary services. It is possible that this group of people may not have ready access to technology at home and therefore may be marginalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and belief</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity and pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The merger of WIS and PICT departments and consequently the TUPE of staff and possible consolidation of resource may present HR issues surrounding those looking to take maternity / paternity leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and civil partnership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender status</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could this policy have an impact on other groups not covered by a protected characteristic? If yes, use the Comments column to describe what this impact could be. If unsure use the Comments column to describe what you need to do to find out.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>People whose first language is not English may not engage with digital services. Effort to investigate Parliament’s primary languages should be undertaken and where possible the use of universal symbolism. It is possible that groups of low socioeconomic status may be less inclined to engage with Parliamentary business in a digital format due to lack of education, wealth or interest. Low wage earners may not have access to technology at home, which may increase marginalisation of this group and reduce accessibility to Parliamentary business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible that a well-designed digital service to enable flexible working and homeworking will benefit and positively impact those with disability and caring responsibilities. Flexible and/or home working can add to the range of possible reasonable accommodations for this. Consideration of the needs of support staff in Parliament with no immediate access to technology is required. There is a potential impact on this group of people whose current technological capabilities may be low and therefore may require upskilling. Ensuring the technology is as assessable and user friendly as possible is required to enable staff to proceed with minimal disruption in carrying out their duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you recommend this policy for a full EA? Use the Comments column to explain your answer and describe the evidence you have based this decision on.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Parliagender Committee Members have reviewed the principles and objectives of the new PDS and recommend that a full Equality Analysis is carried out with further engagement with the Diversity and Inclusion Team and other WENs. The full EA should look to consider the impact of the cultural change on Parliamentary staff and external customers who Parliament wishes to engage with in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: 
Date: 
Approved by:
### Annex 6: DSPT project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of activity (from initial terms of reference)</th>
<th>What have we done?</th>
<th>Work planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of implementation plan</td>
<td>• Papers for Management Boards in June and November</td>
<td>• Plan launch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advice on appointment of new Director              | • Assisted in selection of recruitment consultants  
• Advice on composition of recruitment panel  
• Substantial drafting input into job description |  |
| Preliminary arrangements for recruitment of CTO    |  | • Advice to incoming Director on job description  
• Advice on recruitment process |
| Advice on governance arrangements                  | • Carried out review of governance, published in draft in September, final version in November board paper  
• Commissioned research by Jyoti Chandola, DCCS, into options for performance measures (particularly those which could be made publicly available)  
• Team has accepted responsibility for a risk from an internal audit report relating to website governance | • Assist as required with implementation of agreed changes  
• Finalise work on performance measures for new Director to consider and bring to the Digital Services Board  
• Initiate work on clarifying website governance |
| Advice on PDS corporate functions                   | • Carried out review of corporate functions, published in draft in September, final version in November board paper | • Assist as required with implementation of agreed changes |
| Proposals for baseline budget and headcount | • Participated in discussions about possibility of unallocated MTIP resource for new Director  
• Ensured MTIP includes proposal for major website project (likely to be priority for the new Director)  
• Initiated preparations for 2015-16 business planning round  
• Secured agreement on our involvement in HC and HL 2015-16 business planning, including a joint digital challenge meeting in January | • Review of draft departmental and office business plans to: identify future digital projects; opportunities for collaboration; and areas where digital ways of working could be better exploited  
• Participate in digital challenge meeting  
• Ensure PICT and WIS business planning processes are integrated for 2015-16  
• Look for opportunities in PDS business plan to give the new Director some financial room for manoeuvre |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Transfer of WIS staff to PDS | • Meeting in July with WIS staff about the TUPE process  
• Assisted with drafting of “measures letter” from PICT HR to DHRC  
• Team leader wrote to all WIS staff about the change | • Answer questions / provide information as required |
| Change management processes | • Workshops (12 by end-Oct) on digital aims and priorities for the new Service with close to 100 staff across Parliament  
• Workshop on business planning process for the new Service  
• Presentations by the preparation team at numerous PICT and WIS team meetings (and other events, | • Continue with communications activity, particularly in relation to decisions by the Boards in November, recruitment of the new Director and launch of the Service  
• Workshop planned on increasing PICT/WIS collaboration |
| such as DHRC awayday, WPU team meeting) | • Articles in Member and staff newsletters  
• Blog by the preparation team leader for PICT & WIS staff  
• Preparation team intranet pages detailing activities and papers month-by-month  
• Consultation exercises with interested parties on the different preparation activities e.g. preparation of Board papers, recruitment of the Director of PDS and the corporate review  
• Engagement with external organisations from which we can learn – eg GDS, BBC, John Lewis, other parliamentary bodies  
• Commissioned research (by Sarah Ioannou, DCCS) into examples of best practice in digital engagement from other legislatures (or similar bodies)  
• Other workshops to be organised as required  
• Make recommendations about staff engagement in the development of the digital strategy  
• Finalise research on best practice in other legislatures, to be used to engage staff across Parliament in discussions about our strategic options. |
| Digital strategy | • Options for a digital strategy are emerging from staff workshops  
• The team has initiated continuous improvement work on staff data (phone number, location, job title etc) to see whether there could be quick wins in this area  
• Discussed co-ordination with development of new HC strategy with |
| Draft options paper for new Director (part of induction pack)  
• Make proposals for staff engagement on strategy options  
• Identify possible quick wins for implementation around the time of the launch of the new |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assist with implementation of any recommendations arising from CI work on staff data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Induction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation of induction letter and resource pack (to include options for a digital strategy, risk register, draft benefits realization plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commission handover note from D-PICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify key staff for the new Director to meet and help arrange meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Equality analysis | • Stacey Smith and Martin Westcott-Wreford commissioned to undertake equality analysis screening (annex 5) |
|                   | • Participate in full analysis |
|                   | • Discuss findings with authors and consider how to implement recommendations |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>• Risk register prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arrange risk workshop with Lords internal auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include risk register in Director’s induction pack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Benefits realisation plan | • Draft plan (to include in Director’s induction pack) |